

### **Remarks**

Applicants would like to thank the Office for allowing claims 10-22. Applicants would also like to thank the Office for indicating that claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitation has been incorporated into claim 26 together with an alternative limitation.

### **DRAWINGS**

On page 2, the Office objected to the drawings expressing the opinion that not all of the features of the invention specified by the claims is illustrated. The Office drew applicants' attention to the recitation "attachment comprising material that is the same as the cantilever and the rigid support" in claim 28.

The Office noted that the specification, page 13, lines 17-21, recites that the attachment of the cantilever to the support is executed in the same material (silicon). However, the Office noted that Figure 1 shows a silicon dioxide layer between the silicon cantilever and the silicon support (12). Thus, a silicon adhesive layer between the cantilever and the support is said to be not supported by the drawing figures.

In response, applicants submit a new figure which reflects this disclosure in the specification and is based on Fig. 1. No new matter was added. Applicants request entry of this new figure which is submitted as a new sheet Fig. 5.

### **CLAIMS 23 TO 25**

On page 3, the Office withdrew the allowability of claims 23-25 in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to JP 11-101810 (Hashizume et al.).

### **35 USC 102(B) REJECTIONS**

The Office rejected **claims 23 and 24** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-101810 (Hashizume et al.).

**On page 4**, the Office maintained the rejection of **claim 26** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,717,132 (Watanabe et al.).

**Also on page 4**, the Office rejected **claim 26 and 29** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 9-159680 (Tadashi).

Applicants have amended the only rejected independent claims 23 and 26 to recite:

“wherein the cantilever is *mounted/attached* to the rigid support via an attachment, wherein the attachment is executed via a material which is the same as the cantilever and the rigid support, or wherein the attachment is a silicon oxide layer while the cantilever and rigid support are made from silicon” (emphasis indicates respective wording in claims 23 and 26, respectively).

### **35 USC §103 Rejections**

**On page 5**, the Office rejected claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-101810 (Isamu et al.) in view of US 5,245,863 (Kajimura et al.)

**On page 6**, the Office maintained the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,717,132 (Watanabe et al.) in view of US 5,245,863 (Kajimura et al.)

Applicants have amended independent claims 23 and 26 as indicated above. Without agreeing with the Office’s analysis, applicants respectfully submit that neither Isamu et al. in combination with Kajimura et al. nor Watanabe et al. in combination with Kajimura et al. render obvious the so amended claims. The references do not teach all claimed features nor would a respective modification have been in the purview of the person

skilled in the art. Even if it had been, what applicants deny, the result would not have been predicable.

Applicants submit that the above shows that all remaining rejected claims are patentable over the art cited. An early issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If any issue remains, the Office is urged to call the undersigned at 301-657-1282 for a speedy resolution.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiencies and overpayments to deposit account number 50-3135.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joyce v. Natzmer/  
Joyce von Natzmer  
Reg. No. 48,120  
**Pequignot + Myers LLC**  
Customer No. 46002  
Direct phone: (301) 657-1282

May 2, 2011